

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims, in view of the forgoing amendments and the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

Prior to this Amendment, claims 1-8 were pending. By this Amendment, claims 1-2 and 5-6 have been amended. No claims have been newly added or cancelled. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1-8 will remain pending, of which claims 1 and 5 are independent.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuyama et al. (EP 0481216; hereafter “Okuyama”) in view of Milili et al. (US 5,408,163; hereafter “Milili”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the reason presented below.

### **I. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuyama in view of Milili. Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection and, therefore, respectfully traverse the same.

Okuyama discloses a pair of saddle-type horizontal deflecting coils. (*See*, Specification, Fig. 4(a), page 4, lines 2-5). Okuyama does not teach or suggest, however, that the pair of saddle-type horizontal deflecting coils have a substantially truncated pyramid shape, as required by independent claims 1 and 5.

Milili discloses a horizontal deflection winding **41** comprising upper and lower saddle-shaped coils **41a** and **41b** (*see*, column 4, lines 55-57) and Fig. 9 depicts the shape of the upper and lower saddle-shaped coils **41a** and **41b**. The horizontal deflecting winding **41** is bent outwardly so as to be away from Z-axis in the direction which crosses the Z-axis in the front end turns (Fig. 9). Milili states that “[r]esidual north-south pincushion distortion of a second harmonic nature, known as gullwing distortion, is corrected by modifying the horizontal deflection harmonic field

distribution near the exit region of the deflection field by straightening the curvature of the horizontal portions **51a** of front end turns **51**.” (See, column 6, lines 56-61). Furthermore, Milili states, “[t]o provide good deflection sensitivity, the shape of the inside surface of core **50** and the shape of the horizontal saddle coils **41a** and **41b** closely follow the contour of the initial flare section **32** of picture tube **30**.” (See, column 5, lines 33-39). As such, Milili’s horizontal deflection winding **41** does not have a substantially truncated pyramid shape, as required by independent claims 1 and 5.

Thus, the combination of Okuyama and Milili fails to teach or suggest the limitation “a pair of saddle-type horizontal deflecting coils located substantially symmetrically with respect to a central axis and having substantially a shape of a truncated pyramid,” as recited in claim 1. Moreover, the combination also fails to teach or suggest the limitation that “the deflection yoke includes a pair of saddle-type horizontal deflecting coils located substantially symmetrically with respect to a central axis and having substantially a shape of a truncated pyramid,” as recited in claim 5.

With respect to coil windings, Okuyama discloses various winding density distributions (Figs. 5 and 8). There is nothing in Okuyama, however, that discusses that the winding of one of the vertical deflecting coils has a starting point on the horizontal-axis side within a range of about 5° - 30° and is distributed continuously or intermittently from the starting point to 90° so as to have a plurality of peak parts of a winding ratio in a winding distribution, as required by independent claims 1 and 5.

Along these lines, Milili discloses vertical deflection coils **42a** and **42b**. Milili discloses that the conductor wires of vertical coils **42a, b** are wound with a wire distribution that produces the desired magnetic field harmonic distribution needed for self convergence in an in-line color picture tube (see, column 5, lines 15-23, Figs. 5, 6 and 10). Milili discloses horizontal field distribution functions **H0, H2, H4** and vertical field distribution functions **V0, V2, V4** (Figs. 16-21). Milili also discloses curves of the harmonics of the scalar potential of the magnetic field intensity and harmonics of the horizontal and vertical scalar potentials (Figs. 22-23). Milili does not, however, discuss that the winding of one of the vertical deflecting coils has a starting point on the

horizontal-axis side within a range of about  $5^{\circ}$  -  $30^{\circ}$  and is distributed continuously or intermittently from the starting point to  $90^{\circ}$  so as to have a plurality of peak parts of a winding ratio in a winding distribution, as required by independent claims 1 and 5.

Thus, the combination of Okuyama and Milili also fails to teach or suggest the limitations that “for a position of a horizontal axis perpendicular to the central axis and a position of a vertical axis perpendicular to the central axis and the horizontal axis are given by  $0^{\circ}$  and  $90^{\circ}$ , respectively, along a circumferential direction around the central axis, the winding of one of the vertical deflecting coils has a starting point on the horizontal-axis side within a range of about  $5^{\circ}$  -  $30^{\circ}$  and is distributed continuously or intermittently from the starting point to  $90^{\circ}$  so as to have a plurality of peak parts of a winding ratio in a winding distribution and is wound substantially symmetrically with respect to the vertical axis” as well as the limitation that “the respective windings of the one vertical deflecting coil and the other vertical deflecting coil are wound substantially symmetrically with respect to the horizontal axis,” as recited in claims 1 and 5.

For at least these reasons, Applicants point out that claims 1 and 5 are patentable over the asserted references. Moreover, because claims 2-4 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, claims 2-4 are patentable for at least the reasons presented with respect to claim 1, as well as for their further limitations. Also, because claims 6-8 depend from claim 5, claims 6-8 are patentable for at least the reasons presented with respect to claim 5, as well as for their further limitations.

## **II. Allowable Subject Matter**

In the Office Action, claims 4 and 8 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in this application. At this time, in view of the remarks presented herein, Applicants choose not to amend the claims but reserve the right to do so at a future date. Claim 4 depends

on claim 1 and recites further limitations. Claim 8 depends on claim 5 and recites further limitations. Claims 4 and 8 are allowable at least due to the dependency of claims 1 and 5.

### **III. Conclusion**

All matters having been addressed and in view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and objections of the claims, withdraw the rejections and objections, and pass this application quickly to issue.

If there are any fees due for entry of this submission that are not otherwise accounted for, Applicants ask that any such fees be charged to our Deposit Account No. 03-3975, with reference to Order No. 008312/0306455.

Respectfully submitted,

**PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP**

Handwritten signature of Jeffrey D. Karceski, with the number 47641 and the letters JN written next to it.

JEFFREY D. KARCESKI ↵

Reg. No. 35,914

Tel. No. (703) 905-2110

Fax No. (703) 905-2500

Date: November 10, 2004

P.O. Box 10500

McLean, VA 22102

(703) 905-2000

JDK:yo